1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	RAFAEL ESPINOZA,) Case No.: 1:20-cv-00824-NONE-JLT (HC)
12	Petitioner,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
13	v.) APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL)
14	STANISLAUS COUNTY SHERIFFS) (Doc. 2)
15	DEPARTMENT, Respondent.))
16		<u></u>
17	Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no absolute right to	
18	appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Anderson v. Heinze, 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th	
19	Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984). However, Title 18 U.S.C. §	
20	3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of the case if "the interests of	
21	justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. In the present case, the Court	
22	does not find that the interests of justice require the appointment of counsel at the present time.	
23	Accordingly, Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is DENIED.	
24		
25	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
26	Dated: June 17, 2020	/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
27		UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
28		